



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/833,868	04/12/2001	Jori Arrakoski	NC30307	5180
30973	7590	02/13/2006	EXAMINER	
SCHEEF & STONE, L.L.P.			CHANG, RICHARD	
5956 SHERRY LANE			ART UNIT	
SUITE 1400			PAPER NUMBER	
DALLAS, TX 75225			2663	

DATE MAILED: 02/13/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/833,868

Applicant(s)

ARRAKOSKI ET AL.

Examiner

Richard Chang

Art Unit

2663

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 October 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-29 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-17 and 20-29 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 08/29/2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. Applicant's arguments and amendments with respect to claims 1-17 and 20-29 have been fully considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claims 18-19 had been canceled.

Claims 22-29 are newly added claims.

Examiner's Amendment

2. The indicated allowability of claims 11-14 is withdrawn in view of US patent 6,980,537 B1 ("Liu") and further in view of US patent 6,219,346 B1 ("Maxemchuk"), upon further consideration, a new ground of rejection is made as follow.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

4. Claims 22-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Regarding to Claims 22-23, 26 and 28, the claim is vague and indefinite because the subject matter comprises itself in the claim as "A first-tier sink node comprising at least one first-tier nodes".

Regarding to Claims 24-25, 27 and 29, the claim is vague and indefinite because the subject matter comprises itself in the claim as "A second-tier sink node comprising at least one second-tier nodes".

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 1-17 and 20-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US patent 6,980,537 B1 ("Liu") and in view of US patent 6,219,346 B1 ("Maxemchuk").

Regarding claims 1, 15, 20-22, 24 and 26-29, Liu teaches a two-tier wireless network (2 as a wireless access network for providing radio communication of data) (See Fig. 1A) comprising means and steps of

forming a cluster (12) as the first tier of network (2) (a first-tier mesh) of a plurality of nodes (10) and within a cluster (12) the cluster head (14) (each of the first-tier nodes of the plurality of first-tier nodes) is capable of communicating data with member nodes (at least selected others of the first-tier nodes) wherein one of those cluster member nodes designated as a cluster head node (14) (at least one of the first-tier nodes forming a first-tier sink node) (See Fig. 1A, Col. 6, lines 44-59),

forming a backbone network (16) as the second tier of network (2) (at least a second-tier mesh) of a plurality of the head nodes (14) of different clusters (12) (a plurality of second-tier nodes) and within a backbone network (16) the head nodes (14) of different clusters (12) (each of the second-tier nodes of the plurality of second-tier nodes) is capable of communicating data with each other (at least selected others of the second-tier nodes),

facilitating communications between nodes (14) of different clusters (12) in the backbone network (16) (the second-tier sink node further capable of communicating with the first-tier sink node of said first-tier mesh), and

providing dynamic selection of cluster head nodes within the backbone network (16) (at least one of the second-tier nodes forming a second-tier sink node) (See Fig. 1A, Col. 6, line 63 - Col. 6, line 16).

Liu teaches substantially all the claimed invention but did not disclose expressly the particular application involving wireless integrated with wired network for the wireless access.

Maxemchuk teaches wireless network (90) integrated with wired network (100) for the wireless access (See Fig. 2, Col. 4, lines 13-38).

A person of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to employ Maxemchuk in Liu in order to obtain a two-tier wireless network and to take advantage of wireless integrated with wired network for the wireless access in claims 1, 15, 20-22, 24 and 26-29.

The suggestion/motivation to do so would have been to integrate wireless with wired network for the wireless access, as suggested by Maxemchuk Col. 4, lines 13-38. At the time the invention was made, therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to which the invention pertains to combine Maxemchuk with the Liu to obtain the inventions specified in claims 1, 15, 20-22, 24 and 26-29.

Regarding claim 2, as discussed above, this claim has limitations that are similar to those of claim 1 and Liu further teaches that the first-tier nodes (10) of said first-tier mesh (12) are operable pursuant to first-tier-mesh operational characteristics (operational characteristics suitable to the local range node communication), and wherein the second-tier nodes (14) of said second-tier mesh (16) are operational pursuant to second-tier-mesh operation characteristics, the first-tier-mesh operational characteristics and the second-tier-mesh operation characteristics (operational characteristics suitable to the long range node communication) being, at least in some part, dissimilar (See Fig. 1A, Col. 6, line 63 - Col. 6, line 16), thus it is rejected with the same rationale applied against claim 1 above.

Regarding claim 3, as discussed above, this claim has limitations that is similar to those of claim 2 and Liu further teaches that the first-tier-mesh (12) operation characteristic comprise a first frequency band within which communication of data is effectuated (first transmission frequency), wherein the second-tier-mesh (16) operation characteristics comprise a second frequency bandwidth within which communication of data is effectuated (second transmission frequency), the first frequency bandwidth and the second frequency bandwidth having at least plurality nonoverlapping portions may

be different) (See Fig. 1A, Col. 6, line 63 - Col. 6, line 16), thus it is rejected with the same rationale applied against claim 2 above.

Regarding claim 4, as discussed above, this claim has limitations that is similar to those of claim 1 and Liu further teaches that the head node (14) (at least one first-tier node) of the cluster (12) (said first-tier mesh) and the cluster head nodes (14) (at least one second tier node) of the backbone network (16) (said second-tier mesh) are co-located, the head node (14) of the cluster (12) (the at least one first-tier node co-located with the at least one second-tier node) capable of communicating with a plurality of nodes (10) within the cluster (12) (at least selected others of the first-tier-nodes) and the cluster head nodes (14) of the backbone network (16) (at least one second-tier node co-located with the at least one first-tier node) capable of communicating with the head nodes (14) of different clusters within a backbone network (16) (at least selected others of the second-tier nodes) (See Fig. 1A, Col. 6, line 63 - Col. 6, line 16), thus it is rejected with the same rationale applied against claim 1 above.

Regarding claims 5 and 23, as discussed above, this claim has limitations that are similar to those of claims 1 and 22 and Liu further teaches an ad-hoc mesh which exhibits an ad-hoc configuration and an ad-hoc number of first-tier nodes (See Col. 8, lines 6-13), thus it is rejected with the same rationale applied against claims 1 and 22 above.

Regarding claims 6-7, Maxemchuk further teaches that the first-tier nodes comprises mobile nodes (mobile unit) capable of movement throughout a selected area

(95 service area neighborhood) and which is effectuated pursuant to non line of sight communication techniques (based on mobile station) (See Fig. 1, Col. 2, lines 39-54).

A person of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to employ Maxemchuk in Liu in order to obtain a two-tier wireless network and to take advantage of mobile unit capable of movement throughout a service area neighborhood in claims 6-7.

The suggestion/motivation to do so would have been to have mobile unit capable of movement throughout a service area neighborhood, as suggested by Maxemchuk in Col. 2, lines 39-54. At the time the invention was made, therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to which the invention pertains to combine Maxemchuk with the Liu to obtain the inventions specified in claims 6-7.

Regarding claim 8 and 25. Maxemchuk further teaches that second-tier mesh (80) comprises a pre-configured mesh (fixed wired router node), which exhibits a fixed configuration and a fixed number of second-tier nodes (See Fig. 2, Col. 4, lines 15-42).

A person of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to employ Maxemchuk in Liu in order to obtain a two-tier wireless network and to take advantage of pre-configured wired router node for a fixed configuration and a fixed number of second-tier nodes in claims 8 and 25.

The suggestion/motivation to do so would have been to have pre-configured wired router node for a fixed configuration and a fixed number of second-tier nodes, as suggested by Maxemchuk in Col. 4, lines 15-42. At the time the invention was made, therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to which the

invention pertains to combine Maxemchuk with the Liu to obtain the inventions specified in claims 8 and 25.

Regarding claims 9-10, Maxemchuk further teaches that the second-tier nodes are stationary (fixed wired router) and effectuated pursuant to line of sight communication techniques (based on fixed position) (See Fig. 2, Col. 4, lines 15-42).

A person of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to employ Maxemchuk in Liu in order to obtain a two-tier wireless network and to take advantage of the second-tier nodes being fixed wired and effectuated pursuant to line of sight communication techniques based on fixed position in claims 9-10.

The suggestion/motivation to do so would have been to have the second-tier nodes being fixed wired and effectuated pursuant to line of sight communication techniques based on fixed position, as suggested by Maxemchuk in Col. 4, lines 15-42. At the time the invention was made, therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to which the invention pertains to combine Maxemchuk with the Liu to obtain the inventions specified in claims 9-10.

Regarding claim 11, as discussed above, this claim has limitations that are similar to those of claim 1 and Liu further teaches that a third-tier mesh (170) formed of a plurality of third-tier nodes (15), each of the third-tier nodes of the plurality of third-tier nodes capable of communicating data with at least selected others of the third-tier nodes, at least one of the third-tier nodes forming a third-tier sink node (See Fig. 8, Col. 14, lines 29-45), thus it is rejected with the same rationale applied against claim 1 above.

Regarding claim 12, this claim has limitations that is similar to those of claim 11 and Liu further teaches that the first-tier nodes (10) of said first-tier mesh (12) are operable pursuant to first-tier-mesh operational characteristics (operational characteristics suitable to the local range node communication), and wherein the second-tier nodes (14) of said second-tier mesh (16) are operational pursuant to second-tier-mesh operation characteristics, the first-tier-mesh operational characteristics and the second-tier-mesh operation characteristics (operational characteristics suitable to the long range node communication) being, at least in some part, dissimilar (See Fig. 1A, Col. 6, line 63 - Col. 6, line 16) and it would be obvious applicable to tier 3, thus it is rejected with the same rationale applied against claim 11 above.

Regarding claim 13, this claim has limitations that is similar to those of claims 8 and 11 and it would be obvious applicable to tier 3, thus it is rejected with the same rationale applied against claims 8 and 11 above.

Regarding claim 14, this claim has limitations that is similar to those of claims 8 and 13 and it would be obvious applicable to tier 3, thus it is rejected with the same rationale applied against claims 8 and 13 above.

Regarding claim 16, Maxemchuk further teaches an other of the second-tier nodes (83) of said second-tier mesh (80) positioned between the first second-tier sink node (81) and the second second-tier sink node (85), communications between the first and second second-tier sink nodes effectuated by way of the other of the second-tier nodes (See Fig. 2, Col. 4, lines 13-38).

A person of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to employ Maxemchuk in Liu in order to obtain a two-tier wireless network and to take advantage of an other of the second-tier nodes of second-tier mesh positioned between the first second-tier sink node and the second second-tier sink node in claim 16.

The suggestion/motivation to do so would have been to position an other of the second-tier nodes of second-tier mesh between the first second-tier sink node and the second second-tier sink node, as suggested by Maxemchuk Col. 4, lines 13-38. At the time the invention was made, therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to which the invention pertains to combine Maxemchuk with the Liu to obtain the inventions specified in claim 16.

Regarding claim 17, these claims have limitations that is similar to those of claim 15 and Liu further teaches that data communicated between the first-tier nodes of said first-tier mesh (12) is communicated at a first data rate (first frequency), wherein data communicated between the second tier nodes of said second-tier mesh (16) is communicated at a second data rate (second frequency), the second data rate greater than the first data rate (backbone data rate higher) such that data communicated between the first and second first-tier sink nodes is communicated more quickly by way of the first and second second-tier sink nodes than by way of the first-tier nodes of said first-tier mesh (See Fig. 1A, Col. 6, lines 45-54), thus it is rejected with the same rationale applied against claim 15 above.

Art Unit: 2663

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Richard Chang whose telephone number is (571) 272-3129. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday from 8 AM to 5 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ricky Ngo can be reached on (571) 272-3139. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).


rkC

Richard Chang
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2663


RICKY Q. NGO
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER